

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 10, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1-9 were pending, and rejected claims 1-9. Claims 1 and 4-9 have been amended, canceled or added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-9 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Kohler. Page 12 of the Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kohler and Krause.

Kohler operates in two modes. The first mode is a default mode where no instructions by the message author are provided and in which an entire message is sent to all of the recipients. In this default mode no parts of the message are highlighted. The second mode is a mode in which the author designates parts of the message that only go to some recipients. That is, a first recipient will receive a first part of the message and a second recipient will receive a second part of the message. It is possible in this mode for a third recipient to receive all parts of the message when other recipients (first and second) only receive part of the message. In this case, the parts of the message only for the third recipient are shown highlighted in the message to the third recipient. So, in the default mode there is no highlighting. In the second mode not all of the recipients receive all of the message.

In contrast, the present invention sends the same the message to all recipients; however, each of the recipients can have different parts of the same message highlighted, the parts that are supposed to be particularly noticed by the particular recipient. For example, if the message is being sent to three recipients, all three recipients get the entire message. However, the first recipient may have a first part of the message highlighted while the second recipient may have a second part of the message highlighted.

In this situation, the distinction over Kohler is that in the present invention all of the recipients get the entire message and only some of the copies have highlighted portions and the highlighted portions can be different.

In a concrete, practical example, a sender can be given a chance to determine whether to send or not to send a message, as such is the case with the system of Kohler, the sender may select not to send the message that a receiver needs to receive, and the message consequently ends up not arriving at the receiver.

Let us assume a case in which messages B and C are messages a receiver needs to receive among messages A, B, C and D. And if a sender decides messages A and B are messages the receiver needs to receive, only messages A and B will arrive at the receiver and message C does not arrive as needed. In addition, message B is not presented in any emphasized manner, so that the receiver is required to go through or read both messages A and B.

According to the present invention, all the messages are sent to the receiver therefore, in no circumstance, does the receiver fail to receive a needed message. By sending all the messages it becomes possible to prevent occurrence of inadvertently failing to transmit the messages that are for each receiver and in each message in an emphasized manner. It, thus, becomes possible for each receiver to pick out parts for himself or herself easily.

In the case assumed above, a receiver will receive all of messages A, B, C and D and messages B and C are presented in an emphasized manner so that the receiver can review contents of the needed messages by going only through messages B and C. And even if message A and/or message D are messages the receiver needs to receive, it does not result in a situation where transmission of these messages has been missed or not performed, since they are sent to the receiver while they are not presented in an emphasized manner.

The distinction discussed above is emphasized in the claims where the claims, for example claim 1, recite "receiving transmission information ... highlighting different parts of the transmission information for respective receivers, and preparing E-mail information with the transmission information in which the different parts are highlighted ... transmitting the E-mail information" for respective receivers. This distinction is further emphasized by the current amendment that indicates that "all of the transmission information" is sent (claims 1 and 4-8) and "sending all of the information" (claim 9).

Krause adds nothing to Kohler with respect to this feature of the invention.

It is submitted that the invention of independent claim[s] distinguish[es] over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 3 emphasizes that the sender can emphasize or highlight using key words. In Krause it is the reader that causes words to stand out. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

Serial No. 09/781,329

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

5/4/05

By: _____



J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501